Hermeneutics can make beauty and ugly as neutral (as neutrosophic)

Mihaela-Gabriela Păun[1], Mirela Teodorescu[2]
[1]*University of Bucharest, Doctoral School of Letters, PhD candidate*
[2]*Independent researcher, Craiova, Romania*

Abstract

The study aims to be an application of the neutral-neutrosophic theory of Florentin Smarandache on the fundamental nucleus of Aesthetics: Beauty-Ugly. If a history of Beauty may resort to a long series of theoretical proofs (of which one can deduce the taste of a certain age), a history of Ugliness can at most to look its documents through visual or verbal representations of certain things or beings perceived somehow as "ugly". But if from a point of view one is Beauty and subsequently in time and space this is Ugly, then we can say that we are in a neutrosophical situation. In all ages, "philosophers and artists have proposed definitions of Beauty; thanks to their testimonies can thus reconstruct a history of aesthetic ideas over the time. But other things were with the idea of Ugly. Most often, Ugly was defined in opposition to the Beauty, but almost never have been dedicated ample studies, but some hints in parenthesis or some marginal notes" as U. Eco asserts (Eco, 2005).

Keywords: beauty, ugly, neutrosophy

1   Hermeneutic method

Hermeneutists agree that there is an irrepressible tendency to project modern meanings of words on the texts that represent a neutrosophic approach. Any reading is contextual, situational, circumstantial. Trying to abandon the cogitative and language perspective of the present moment is convicted to failure.

The hermeneutist cannot entirely escape from the condition of present time being. A cogitative and language horizon allows every reading. Heidegger believes that the text must be interpreted within the hermeneutical horizon of the moment of its production. The interpreter's limit is the author quality. Once written, the work refuses whoever produced it, and it isolates and wrongs him. The author will never provide the best interpretation of his own work, if such an interpretation is there somehow. The author does not have a right of interpretation derived from the right he has previously had to write. When ending the work, he loses his power over the product. As interpretation, the work exceeds the authorial jurisdiction. The work is for the author, as for any other hermeneutist, a closed shop. Leaving the room, the producer of the speech loses, without ever having it, the key to interpretation. "A work dies not when it is not read for a while in order to find the best foundation. A work dies only when the internal interpretability, as a message reserve, is finished. The work dies when it no longer speaks to us. Dead works are cold stars" (Smarandache & Vladutescu, 2014).

Neutrosophy as an analytical study, it is related to multiple-valued logic because at one moment one shows that a statement <A> was proved true by a philosopher X whereas latter another philosopher Y proved the opposite statement <Anti-A> was true. Therefore, both <A> and <Anti-A> were true. {Whence one can deduce that both <A> and <Anti-A> could be false.} Even more, using a neutrosophic interpretation, one could say that other ideas in between <A> and <Anti-A> and related to them, noted by <Neut-A>, could be true as well. This relates to dialetheism, which says that some contradictions are true, to paraconsistent logic, to intuitionistic logic, till neutrosophic logic (where <A>, <Anti-A>, and ideas in between them belonging to <Neut-A> could all be true or partially true) (Smarandache, 2005). In this manner can be treated the Beauty and the Ugly in arts. Neutrosophy is the appropriate theory for the valuea belonging arts.

Hermeneutics of Hermeneutics: An idea <A>, by interpretation, is generalized, is particularized, is commented, is filtered, eventually distorted to <A1> different from <A>, to <A2> different from <A>, and so on. Everybody understands what he wants, according to his level of knowledge, his soul, and hisinterest. <A> is viewed as <Non-A> and even <Anti-A> at some degree (ill-defined). But all deformed versions of this idea syncretize in an <A> way.

Idealists were so formal, empiricists so informal. Neutrosophy is both. Neutrosophy as a new science must introduce something new as investigation

approach, it can also be seen and interpreted as: new approach to philosophy; philosophy of philosophies; non-philosophy; super-philosophy; neophilosophy; God and Devil of the philosophy; metaphilosophy, macro-philosophy; New World Order in philosophy; paradox of philosophy and philosophy of the paradox; thought of thought; showing the philosophy's perfection and imperfection simultaneously; paradox within/from paradox: there are infinitely many; world's enigma; nature's essence; enigma of the world; any substance ultimately has a neutrosophic attribute; life without paradox would be monotonous and boring, linear; paradoxist intuition is a high level of awareness; postmodernist; an algebraic, physical and chemical philosophy; consistent with its inconsistence- everything that belongs to social existence.

Very consistent are the statement related to life and death, no place to any other comment: "The Ultimate Paradox: Living is the process of dying. Reciprocally: Death of one is the process of somebody else's life [an animal eating another one]" (Smarandache, 2005). Pertinent and palpable entities and constituted of doubtful, invisible, uncertain items, and however real. "Our visible world is composed of a totality of invisible particles. Things with mass result from atoms with quasi-null mass. Infinity is formed of finite part(icle)s" (Smarandache, 2005).

Solomon Marcus, a reputed mathematrician perceived the frequent presence of paradoxes, "The paradox invaded all activity's fields, all scientific and artistic disciplines. It is not a marginal phenomenon anymore, but in the heart of the act and the human thought" (Smarandache, 2005; apud Marcus, 1984). S. Marcus felt the necessity of a science to govern all these paradoxes, "Outside the paradox we are not able to understand the world. We have to learn to identify the paradox in its stages of an extraordinary diversity, to discover its functional mechanisms for incarcerating and controlling it, and possibly manipulating it in order not to be ourselves manipulated by this" (Smarandache, 2005; apud Marcus, 1984). The paradox had a quickly evolution in our existence, "If not long ago the paradox was considered a symptom of a pathological state, in the last decades it is more frequent an opposite facet of paradox: that of a healthy, normal state" (Smarandache, 2005; apud Marcus, 1984).

2 Ways of Beauty and Ways of Ugly

The theme of Beauty was developed by Socrates and Plato. First, according to the testimony of Xenophon's from Memorabilia (on the veracity of

which today hovers some doubts, as author's sectarianism), seems to have followed the legitimation, conceptual, of artistic practice, through distinction between at least three different aesthetic categories: Ideal Beauty representing the nature by assembling of its parts; Spiritual Beauty that expresses the soul through the eyes (as in the sculptures of Praxiteles, over which he colored stone eyes of the characters to make them look even true) and Useful Beauty, meaning functional. More Complex is Plato's view, from which will arise the two most important concepts about Beauty developed over the centuries: Beauty as harmony and proportion of the parts (with roots in Pythagoras' thinking) and Beauty as shine, as depicts it in Phaedrus, idea that will influence the Neoplatonic's thinking. "It is true that, says Umberto Eco, for the first Pythagoreans, the harmony consists of in opposition not only between odd and even, but also between limited and unlimited, unity and plurality, right and left, male and female, square and rectangle, straight line and curved line and so on", but it seems that for Pythagoras and his direct disciples, "in the opposition between two contraries, only one element is perfection: odd, the straight line and the square are always good and beautiful, the reverse realities representing the error, evil and disharmony" (Eco, 2005). It will be different the solution proposed by Heraclitus: if there are contradictory elements in the universe, realities that seem to not be able to reconcile, such as unity and plurality, love and hate, peace and war, calmness and movement, then harmony between these opposites will not be achieved by canceling one of them, on the contrary, leaving both of them to live in constant tension, we should say, they would induce a state of uncertainty, the neutrosophy. Harmony does not mean absence, but the balance of contrasts. Pythagoreans of the next generation, who lived between the V and IV B.C., like Philolaus and Architas will take these suggestions and will incorporate them into the body of their doctrine. "So, take birth the idea of a balance between two opposing entities which neutralize each other, notes Umberto Eco, a polarity between two contradictory aspects that become harmonic only because enter in conflict, generating thus, if they are implemented on visual plane, a symmetry" (Eco, 2005).

We call good also what is in accordance with an ideal principle that means pain, such as be the glorious death of a hero, the devotion of that one who cares a leper, parent sacrifice who gives his life to save his son ... In this cases we recognize that that thing is good, but because of selfishness or fear, we did not want to be involved in an analogous experience. We recognize that as a good thing, but as the good of others, that we look with a certain detachment, even if with emotion, no

desire to feel dragged. Often, to indicate full of noble acts, which we admire rather than perpetrated them, we talk about "beautiful facts".

Beautiful as graceful, cute, or sublime, wonderful, gorgeous, and other expressions of the sort, is an adjective that we often use to describe something that we like. It seems that, in this respect, what is beautiful coincides with what is good, and indeed in different historical epochs were set very close connections between Beautiful and Good. But if we judge by our daily experience, we tend to define as good not only what we like, but what we would like to have for us. There are endless things we consider good: a shared love, wealth obtained about honest, a culinary delight, and in all cases we would like to have that good. It's so good everything stimulates our desire. Even when we judge as good a virtuous action, we would like to be made by us, or we aim to do something as well worthy, being driven by the example which we consider to be good.

An evaluation of Ugliness has some traits in common with an assessment of Beauty. First, we can only assume that the ordinary people's taste would correspond to some extent with the artistic taste of their times. "If a visitor came from outer space would enter into a contemporary art gallery, and would see female faces painted by Picasso and would hear that visitors consider them beautiful, would make the mistaken belief that the everyday reality men of our times consider beautiful and enticing that female creatures whose face resembles to that represented by the painter" (Eco, 2007). The same visitor from space could change opinions if they attend a fashion show or a Miss Universe contest, which will see that are agreed other Beauty models. Hegel in his Aesthetics, wrote: "Perhaps not every husband on his wife, but anyway every fiance's fiancee consider beautiful, beautiful exclusively; and if subjective taste for this Beauty has no fixed rule, is a real luck to both sides "... or prioritizing global values, "it is often said that a European Beauty would not appeal to a Chinese or a Hottentot, as the Chinese has a conception of Beauty quite different from that of a black", each evaluator with its own reference system, "and conversely, if we consider works of art of such non-European peoples, for example the way they are portrayed their gods, conceived in their imagination as sublime and worthy of veneration", for us they can occur as "totally monstrous idols, in the same measure as that their music can sound downright despicable for our ears". In the same manner, in turn, "those people can count as sculptures, paintings, our music is devoid of significance or beauty" (Hegel, Aesthetics).

Often the label of Beauty or Ugliness was attributed not on aesthetic

criteria, but on political and social issues. There is a passage in Marx (economic and philosophical Manuscripts of '44) in which is reminded that the possession of money can compensate the Ugliness: "Money, as has the ability to buy anything, to take possession of any object, is therefore subject by excellence ... The greater is my strength, as the higher is the power of money ... What I am and I can is not therefore at all determined by my individuality. I am ugly, but I can buy the most beautiful of women", so ugliness can be canceled, masked, hidden by this money, "as person I am hideous and crippled, but my money make me twenty-four feet; so no longer crippled. Is my money converting all my deficiencies in their opposite?"

On other side "It is enough to extend this thinking, shows U. Eco, about the power of money at a more general level and we shall understand more about the portraits of monarchs in the past ages, immortalized with devotion by court painters who, not wanting to highlight their flaws, do everything possible to sweeten their traits". These characters appear to us, no doubt, quite ugly (and so were probably on their time), but they were the "bearers of charismas", have such a born fascination of their omnipotence", that were regarded with adoration by their subjects (Eco, 2007). This transformation, passing from an evaluation state in another evaluation is the subject of neutrosophy, uncertainty.

"Sustaining that the Beauty and the Ugly are related to different times and cultures (or even planets) does not mean that they have all been attempts to define these two concepts according to a stable model" sustains Eco (Eco, 2005). If it would to reflect on that attitude of detachment that allows us to define "as beautiful as well that not awakens in us the desire, we should understand that, after all we are talking about Beauty whenever we enjoy something simply because it exists, whether or not that thing is in our possession" explains U. Eco (Eco, 2005). Even the wedding cake masterfully done, if we admire in the window of a pastry, "reveals itself as beautiful", whether for health reasons or lack of appetite we not want it as a good that must be won". It's nice that, if it were ours, "it would bringus delight", but "still remains beautiful even if it belongs to someone else" (Eco, 2005). Naturally we do not discuss here the attitude of "that one being in front of a beautiful object, such as its owner, from the desire to be admired every day or for its great economical value" (Eco, 2005). All of these forms of "passion, jealousy, desire of possession, envy or greed have nothing to do with the sense of Beauty" (Eco, 2005).

Regarding the artistic Ugly, almost all aesthetic theories, at least from ancient Greece to today argue that any form of ugliness can be saved by a faithful and effective artistic representation. Aristotle (in Poetics 1448b) talks about the

possibility of representation of Beautyby masterfully imitating of what is repulsive, and Plutarch (in De audiedis Poetisa) argues that in the artistic representation imitated Ugly remains as such, but by the mastership artistry is loaded of the reverberations of Beauty.

Theorists often do not take into account the many individual variables, "the idiosyncrasies or deviant behaviors". It is true that the "experience of Beauty involves a disinterested contemplation, but it is likely that a teenager with certain disorders have a passionate reaction even in face of a statue Venus of Milo". The same thing is available also for the category of Ugly: "a storybook which can cause terrible dreams to children, while the other children of the same age, it remains just a funny illustration" (Eco, 2007).

Ugly could be defined simply as the opposite of Beauty, even if it is a concept that is changed with the evolution of its otherwise? The first and most complete Aesthetics of Ugly, developed by Karl Rosenkrantz in 1853, draws an analogy between Ugly and moral evil. So as evil and sin opposite good, related to which is hell, as well Ugly is "The hell of Beauty". Rosenkrantz resumes the traditional idea according to which Ugly is the opposite of Beauty or rather a sort of possible error that Beauty can contain within himself; and thus any aesthetic, in its quality of science of Beauty, is required to approach the concept of Ugly. But when Rosenkrantz passes from the abstract definitions to phenomenology of the various embodiments of Ugly, we get the ability to foresee a kind of "autonomy of Ugly", making it to present itself as something much richer and more complex than a series of simple negation of various forms of beautiful. He thoroughly examines Natural Ugly, Spiritually Ugly, Ugly in art (with its various forms of artistic inaccuracies), formlessness, asymmetry, disharmony, disfigurement and deformity (to be insignificant, weak, coward, banal, random, arbitrary, grossly) different forms that have being repulsive (awkwardness, death, abysse, terrible, stupidity, unpleasent, delinquency, spectral, demonic, witchcraft, satanic) (Eco, 2007).

If we analyze the synonyms of the words beautiful and ugly, we find that what is considered beautiful is cute, graceful, pleasant, attractive, delicious, charming, attractive, harmonious, wonderful, delicate, nice, agreeable, magnificent, splendid, fascinating, excellent, exceptional fabulous, fairytale, fantasy, magic, mirabilite, valuable, spectacular, sublime, superb, and it is considered ugly everything is repulsive, horrible, disgusting, unpleasant, the grotesque, abominable, disgusting, hateful, indecent, polluted, dirty, obscene,

hideous, terrifying, abject, monstrous, horrible, horrifying, miscreated, nasty, scary, terrible, cruel, nightmarish, revolting, repulsive, disgusting, brackish, fetid, despicable, repugnant, hulking, oppressive, indecent, deformed, distorted (without counting the horror that can occur in areas traditionally attributed Beauty, like the fairy tale world, of fantasy, of magic, of the sublime) (Eco, 2007).

It might even suggest, as did Nietzsche in Twilight of the Gods, that "in Beauty, man puts himself as the norm of perfection" and "in it praises ... Man in fact is reflected in things and believes beautiful everything that neglects the face" and Ugly is understood as "a sign or a symptom of degeneration ... any symptom of exhaustion, of the disturbance, of the aging, of the fatigue, any form of non-freedom, such as convulsions or paralysis, but especially the smell, color, dissolution shape, of putrefaction, all evoke the same kind of reaction, "ugly" as a value judgment ... What now hates man? Undoubtedly, hates twilight of his own model" (Nietzsche). "Nietzsche's argument, shows U. Eco, is narcissistic anthropomorphic type, but it learn us that Beauty and Ugliness are defined according to a "specific" model, "that depends on the species" and the notion of species is extended from people from all other entities".

3   Conclusions

Probably most contemporaries of Rembrandt, instead of admiration for the skill with which he knew how to paint a sectioned cadaver on anatomic study table, they felt more like horror, as in front of a real corpse. Similarly, who experienced the bombardment might not look Picasso's Guernica with disinterested aesthetic detachment, but to relive the terror that old experience. So, we have also to consider the chorus witches from Macbeth (Shakespeare) if they have or not right, when shouting "Beauty is Ugly and Ugly is Beauty". So says also Brancusi, he doesn't create the Beauty, he just removes unnecessary material to be easier for us to discover new Beauty next to him. Similarly we define (is removed) <anti-A> for Beauty and for its sense, to be visible the Beauty of our existence in front of nonexistence. Of nonexistence fears any existence, even the Universe itself, maybe nonexistence in itself is not afraid of itself, or people who in their existence forget or do not know that they exist there. Similarly we define (we remove) <anti A> for the Beauty and its sense, to be visible the beauty of our existence in front of the nonexistence.

References

Aristotel (2011). *Poetica*. București: Univers Enciclopedic.

Boldea, I. (2002). Canonul în literatura română. *Studia Universitatis Petru Maior-Philologia*, (01), 32-37.

Călinescu, G. (1968). *Principii de estetică*. Bucuresti: Editura pentru literatură.

Bunăiaşu, C. M., Vlăduţescu, Ş., & Strungă, A. C. (2014). Managerial competences in the field of university curriculum for virtual learning communities. *Revista Romaneasca pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, *6*(2), 17-27.

Crăciun, G. (2003). Introducere în teoria literaturii. Cartier.

Dima, A., & Muthu, M. (2003). Gândirea românească în estetică: aspecte contemporane. Dacia.

Eco, U. (2005). *Istoria Frumosului*. Bucuresti: Rao,

Eco, U. (2007). *Istoria Urâtului*. Bucuresti: Rao.

Gifu, D., Modrak, V., & Teodorescu, M. (2014). Highlights on mental processes in management. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, (24), 56-65.

Guyau, J. M. (1990). *Problemele esteticii contemporane*. Bucureşti: Meridiane.

Hegel, G. W. F. (1966). *Prelegeri de estetică*. vol. I. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei.

Ionescu, D., & Teodorescu, M. (2014). Florentin Smarandache & Ştefan Vlăduţescu: Neutrosophic emergences and incidences in communication and information–Book review. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, (27), 94-99.

Lefter, I. B. (2012). *Recapitularea modernităţii. Pentru o nouă istorie a literaturii române.* Ediţia a II-a. Cu un epilog despre neomodernism. Piteşti: Paralela 45.

Lungu, Corina (2014). Semantic equivalences in Romanian medical terminology. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 1.

Marcus, S. (1984). *Paradoxul*. Bucureşti: Albatros.

Moraru, M. (1997). *De nuptiis Mercurii et Philologiae*. Editura Fundaţiei culturale române.

Nietzsche, F. (1993). *Amurgul zeilor*. Bucureşti: Antet XX Press.

Rosenkranz, K. (1984). *O estetică a urâtului între frumos şi comic*, traducere, studiu introductiv şi note de Victor Ernest Maşek. Bucureşti: Editura Meridiane.

Smarandache, F. (1998). A Unifying Field in Logics, Neutrosophic Logic/Neutrosophy, Neutrosophic Set, Neutrosophic Probability, Am. Res. Press.

Smarandache, F. (2000). Linguistic Paradoxes and Tautologies. *Collected Papers, Vol. III*, *3*, 122.

Smarandache, F. (2005). A Unifying Field in Logics: Neutrosophic Logic. Neutrosophy, Neutrosophic Set, Neutrosophic Probability: Neutrsophic Logic. Neutrosophy, Neutrosophic Set, Neutrosophic Probability. Infinite Study.

Smarandache, F. (2010). *Neutrosophic Logic as a Theory of Everything in Logics*. Multispace and Multistructure. Neutrosophic Transdisciplinariry (100 Collected Papers of Sciences), 525-527.

Smarandache, F. (2010). *The Neutrosophic Research Method in Scientific and Humanistic*

Fields. In Smarandache, F. (Ed.), Multispace and Multistructure. Neutrosophic Transdisciplinariry (100 Collected Papers of Sciences) (pp. 732-733). Vol. 4. Hanko: NESP.

Smarandache, F., & Vlăduțescu, Ș. (2014). *Neutrosophic Emergences and Incidences in Communication and Information*. Saarbrucken: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.

Smarandache, Florentin & Vlăduțescu, Ștefan (2014). Communicative Universal Convertibility Matter-Energy-Information. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 1.

Tatarkiewicz, W. (1978). *Istoria esteticii*. Vol. I. București: Meridiane.

Vianu, T. (1996). *Estetica*. Editura Orizonturi.

Vlăduțescu, Ș. (2014). Convictive Communication and Persuasive Communication. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, (15), 164-170.

Vlăduțescu, Ș. (2014). Uncertainty Communication Status. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, (10), 100-106.